

Appl. No. 09/840,210
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of August 24, 2004

Page 5 of 7

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. An Office action mailed on August 24, 2004 rejected claims 1-4 and 7-8, objected to claims 5 and 6, and noted that claims 9-17 are withdrawn. By this amendment claims 1-4 and 7 are amended.

Rejections of Claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The August 24, 2004 Office Action rejected claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d'Iribarne et al. (US Patent 4,826,522). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method of manufacturing a display tube by press-forming a hot glass panel to form a hot display tube having a face and sidewalls that are connected by inner corners and then cooling the hot display tube such that surface temperatures of the inner corners remain below a strain point temperature.

d'Iribarne et al. discloses a method of making tempered glass sheets having reinforced edge stresses. Those edge stresses are formed by cooling the edges faster than the remainder of the sheet. In contrast, claim 1 recites a method of manufacturing a display tube, not a glass sheet. That display tube has inner corners (not edges) that connect a face to sidewalls. During manufacture, the hot display tube is cooled such that the surface temperatures of the inner corners remain below a strain point temperature during cooling.

If the principles of d'Iribarne et al. were applied to a display tube, the result would be stressed edges but unstressed inner corners. While the edges might be strengthened, residual heat in the thick glass corners would stress-relieve the glass panel, leaving it subject to tensile damage. Simply put, d'Iribarne's cooling of edges is inapplicable to the present invention.

Consequently, since claim 1 is patentable over d'Iribarne et al. claims 2-4 and 7-8, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are also allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Page 6 of 7

Appl. No. 09/840,210
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of August 24, 2004

Objections to claims 5 and 6

The Examiner is thanked for finding that claims 5 and 6 would be allowable. The Applicant understands that the rejection referred to with regard to the allowable subject matter is the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection discussed above with reference to claims 1-4 and 7-8 (and not the 35 U.S.C. §112 2nd paragraph rejection mentioned on page 4 of the August 24, 2004 Office action).

However, because the Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable, at this time the Applicant does not chose to amend claims 5 and 6. However, the Applicant reserves the right to amend the claims to obtain the allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly requested.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone call would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call Mr. Eric Bram at (914) 333-9635 or John M. Kelly at (732) 530-9404. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the address of record (not to the signing attorney).

Page 7 of 7

Appl. No. 09/840,210
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of August 24, 2004

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, or if any additional fees are required, kindly charge that fee to deposit account number 20-0782.

Respectfully submitted,

Nov. 24, 2004

John M. Kelly
John M. Kelly, Attorney
Reg. No. 33,920
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
Attorneys at Law
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808

319973-1

Atty. Docket NoNL-0000191